

**Amendments to the Drawings:**

None

## REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claim 3 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Krishnan.

Claim 3 comprises the limitation of: a) implanting first dopant atoms into a semiconductor body to create a first-conductivity-type well diffusion therein; and b) implanting second dopant atoms into said semiconductor body, with more than twice the stopping distance and less than one-quarter of the dosage per unit area as said step a), to compensate atoms which channeled during said step a). From claim 3, the second dopant atoms will compensate the atoms which channeled during the implant of step a). In the semiconductor art, the word compensate when used in reference to implanted dopant atoms is a term of art. In this context the word is used to describe dopant atoms of opposite conductivity type where the overall doping concentration due to any single atom is reduced. This is illustrated in Fig. 3 where the positive dopant atoms will compensate the negative dopant atoms in the region 316.

The Krishnan reference teaches implanting dopant atoms of the same conductivity type, i.e., N-. In forming the rejection, the examiner states that the second dopant implant is intended to ‘compensate’ for the channel doping. Claim 3 requires the second implanted atoms to compensate the first implanted atoms and not some other region of the semiconductor. The compensation of the channel region in the Krishnan reference does not read on the claimed limitation. Based on the above, claim 3 is allowable over the cited art.

Claims 4, 5, and 6 were added. Claim 4 comprises the limitation of implanting dopant species of a second conductivity type into said well to a second depth wherein said second depth is greater than said first depth. The Krishnan reference teaches implanting the same N- dopant type and claim 4 is allowable over the cited art. Claims 5 and 6 depend on claim 4 and therefore contain all the limitations of claim 4. Claims 5 and 6 are therefore also allowable over the cited art.

In light of the above, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance, and notice to that effect is respectfully requested.

While it is believed that the instant response places the application in condition for allowance, should the Examiner have any further comments or suggestions, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner contact the undersigned in order to expeditiously resolve any outstanding issues.

To the extent necessary, Applicants petition for an Extension of Time under 37 CFR 1.136. Please charge any fees in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to the deposit account of Texas Instruments Incorporated, Account No. 20-0668.

Respectfully submitted,



Peter K. McLarty  
Attorney for Applicants  
Reg. No. 44,923

Texas Instruments Incorporated  
P.O. Box 655474, MS 3999  
Dallas, TX 75265  
(972) 917-4258